

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-32, all the claims pending in the application, stand rejected. Claims 1, 5, 13, 22 and 26 are amended.

#### ***Interview***

As a preliminary matter, Applicants wish to express their appreciation to the Examiner and his supervisor for the courtesy and initiative demonstrated during an interview with the Applicants' representative during an interview on October 29, 2009. The present amendment reflects the results of that interview and the comparison of the prior art patents to Rankin and McCarten et al to the invention as originally disclosed. Applicants have added limitations to the claims to define the respective locations of persons in a venue that are centrally stored as being physical locations and not IP addresses as taught by Rankin. In addition, Applicants have noted that at least one of the language delivery options is a real time translation from one language to a selected language. On the basis of the discussion and the amendments made, the present claim set should be allowable for the reasons subsequently provided.

#### ***Claim Objections***

In Claim 5 line 3, the Examiner assumes "each person having respective identifiable locations" should be "each person having a respective identifiable location". The Examiner is correct and an appropriate correction has been made.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

**Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.** This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

The Examiner notes that in claim 13, the limitation "said common venue" in line 2 has no antecedent basis. An appropriate change has been made.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

**Claims 1 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rankin et al. (2002/0135515) in view of McCarten et al. (5,959,596).** This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

**Amended Claim 1**

The invention is directed to a method of providing (1) a common output content in multiple languages (2) to multiple electronically identifiable physical locations within a common venue (the preferred exemplary embodiment being the cabin of an aircraft) and (3) receiving the content in one of the multiple languages at a respective location at the selection of the user at that location, (4) under centralized control at a source, that includes a data base correlating language choices to the electronically identifiable user locations. The central source can provide language choices for one or more applications, at least one such application including a real time translation into a language of choice.

**Rankin**

At pages 4 and 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner repeats the text of his discussion of Rankin from the previous Office Action at pages 3 and 4. This text is not applicable to the claimed invention at all, as the Examiner admits at pages 5 and 6 of the outstanding Office Action that Rankin has nothing to do with the basic focus of the invention, namely, transmitting from a common source to plural persons in a common venue who receive individualized transmissions in a selected one of multiple languages. However, during the interview, the Examiner noted that the transportation platform 100 has a transmitter that can couple to plural users, as explained at paragraphs [0011] and [0012] where individual passengers on the platform carry on and off the platform various personal user terminals, such as mobile phones, PDAs and laptop PCs, and can communicate with the transport beacon. In this way, the transport beacon 202 acts as a relay for information accessed at various geographical locations from a base station 204, as illustrated in Fig. 2.

**Rankin's Disclosure of Multiple Users are not at Physically Identifiable Locations Stored Centrally**

The Examiner explained during the interview that the mobile user terminals on the transport platform, such as PC, PDA, and mobile phone, are electronically identifiable by IP address stored at the terminal beacon and would meet the claim limitations.

Applicants' representative explained that the several locations stored by the centralized source or server in the present invention are physical locations in the venue, such as seats on an aircraft, and are identified by the stored locations when distributing selected language programming or information. The Examiner agreed that this is a difference and Applicants have added to the claim reference to the electronically identifiable locations being physical locations in the venue.

Rankin's Teachings of Multiple Languages Is Not Detailed or Relevant

In the Response to Arguments at pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner comments with regard to arguments made as to dependent claims 9 and 11, and makes no mention of the independent claims. As to the dependent claims, the Examiner argues that Rankin's teachings in paragraphs 0029 and 0067 are not limited to pre-recorded public announcements and argues that the reference should be combinable with Kumano.

The Examiner's position, however, ignores the fact that Rankin is concerned with a transmission from a local beacon to the train, as the train passes by, so that local advertising and news can be directed to users on the train. The brief mention in paragraph 0029 of "announcements in different user-terminal selectable languages" has no accompanying detail. Such wireless transmission could be on multiple channels in different languages that are selected by a user, as one would select radio stations in a car. Similarly, the mention of personalized transmissions "to reflect individual language preferences or details" has no accompanying detail. At the least, there is no centralized source in the common venue that transmits selectively in one of multiple languages to respective users in the common venue.

The Examiner admits that "Rankin does not specifically mention each of a plurality of persons having respective identifiable locations relative to other of said plurality of persons in said venue, and respective identifiable locations in said venue."

Claim Now Requires At Least One Real Time Translation

In order to distinguish Rankin's broad teaching that multiple languages can be received, Applicants are further amending the claim to include at least one application having real time translation of messages from the centralized source. In the exemplary embodiment of the aircraft

cabin, the airline crew can either make voice announcements in one language that are translated in real time into another selected language or enter text in one language that is translated in real time into text of another selected language. Nothing in the prior art suggests these features that offer unique capability to a variety of venues where multiple persons have various selectable language requirements.

### **McCarten**

The Examiner asserts that McCarten discloses that ‘each of a plurality of persons having respective identifiable locations relative to other of said plurality of persons in a venue, and respective identifiable locations in a venue (**Col 1 lines 44-46**, a set of unique seat display units which are associated with each seat in the airplane).’

### **No Centralized Control as Claimed**

Claim 1 now specifically defines the claimed system as being “centralized” and specifies that the source and data base are centrally located within the common venue for distribution to the plural respective electronically identifiable locations in the common venue.

McCarten expressly distinguishes the invention from one that has centralized control at col. 1, lines 23-26, for example one where video games are operated by a master computer. Instead, McCarten teaches that the entire application is downloaded from a master station to unit at each user location, where the application is executed locally. In other words, as expressed at col. 2, lines 52-55, the processing communications system is distributed and not centralized. Moreover, to the extent that there is “language selection” as suggested in the abstract, such selection would be on the basis of pre-recorded or programmed languages in a given game program, and not on the basis of a translation made or provided centrally, as in the present invention. As is clear from the explanation at col. 4, lines 27-43, the game or movie selected would already be in the desired language, and would not involve a real time translation.

### **No Centralized Storage of Language Choice**

As clearly stated in the claim, the choice of language made by each user is stored centrally. Such central storage is contrary to the operations in Rankin and McCarten.

No Centralized Access and Use of Language Choice

More importantly, the claim requires access by one or more applications to the centrally stored choices of language, and operation of the application selectively on the basis of the choice stored. Such claimed use is contrary to the teachings of McCarten, where the language selection is local and with the distributed application at each user location.

**Amended Claim 22**

The Examiner applies the same analysis for rejection as stated at pages 4 and 5 of the Office Action dated September 5, 2008, but now admits that “Rankin does not specifically mention each of a plurality of persons having respective identifiable locations relative to other of said plurality of persons in said common venue, and respective identifiable locations in said common venue.”

The Examiner looks to McCarten for a disclosure that “each of a plurality of persons having respective identifiable locations relative to other of said plurality of persons in a common venue, and respective identifiable locations in a common venue (**Col 1 lines 44-46**, a set of unique seat display units which are associated with each seat in the airplane).”

Independent claim 22 has been amended in a manner similar to claim 1. The claim would be patentable for the reasons given for claim 1.

**Claims 2-5, 7, 12, 13, 17, 20, 21, 23-26, and 28-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rankin et al. (2002/0135515) in view of McCarten et al. (5,959,596), in further view of Poch (5,152,003).** This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

**Claim 5**

The Examiner applies the same analysis for rejection as stated at pages 5-7 of the Office Action dated September 5, 2008, but now admits that “Rankin does not specifically mention each of a plurality of persons having respective identifiable locations relative to other of said plurality of persons in said common venue, and respective identifiable locations in said common venue.”

The Examiner looks to McCarten for a disclosure that “each of a plurality of persons having respective identifiable locations relative to other of said plurality of persons in a common

venue, and respective identifiable locations in a common venue (**Col 1 lines 44-46**, a set of unique seat display units which are associated with each seat in the airplane).”

The Examiner further admits that “Rankin and McCarten do not specifically mention a principal language. Poch discloses a principal language (**Col 2-3 lines 59-10**, one language being associated with a message identification datum and translations).”

Independent claim 5 has been amended in a manner similar to claim 1. The claim would be patentable for the reasons given for claim 1.

### **Claim 13**

The Examiner applies the same analysis for rejection as stated at pages 7-9 of the Office Action dated September 5, 2008, but now admits that “Rankin does not specifically mention each of a plurality of persons having respective identifiable locations relative to other of said plurality of persons in said common venue, and respective identifiable locations in said common venue.”

The Examiner looks to McCarten for a disclosure that “each of a plurality of persons having respective identifiable locations relative to other of said plurality of persons in a common venue, and respective identifiable locations in a common venue (**Col 1 lines 44-46**, a set of unique seat display units which are associated with each seat in the airplane).”

The Examiner further admits that “Rankin and McCarten do not specifically mention a principal language, and wherein said language choice of a respective person comprises said principal language where said person has not indicated a language choice. Poch discloses a principal language, and wherein said language choice of a respective person comprises said principal language where said person has not indicated a language choice (**Col 2-3 lines 59-10**, one language being associated with a message identification datum and translations...receivers programmed to receive message in one language).”

Independent claim 13 has been amended in a manner similar to claim 1. The claim would be patentable for the reasons given for claim 1.

### **Claim 26**

The Examiner applies the same analysis for rejection as stated at pages 9-10 of the Office Action dated September 5, 2008, but now admits that “Rankin does not specifically mention each

of a plurality of persons having respective identifiable locations relative to other of said plurality of persons in said common venue, and respective identifiable locations in said common venue.”

The Examiner looks to McCarten for a disclosure that “each of a plurality of persons having respective identifiable locations relative to other of said plurality of persons in a common venue, and respective identifiable locations in a common venue (**Col 1 lines 44-46**, a set of unique seat display units which are associated with each seat in the airplane).”

The Examiner further admits that “Rankin and McCarten do not specifically mention if no language was chosen by a respective passenger, providing in a principal language. Poch discloses if no language was chosen by a respective passenger, providing in a principal language (**Col 2-3 lines 59-10**, one language being associated with a message identification datum and translations...receivers programmed to receive message in one language).”

Independent claim 26 has been amended in a manner similar to claim 1. The claim would be patentable for the reasons given for claim 1.

**Claims 2, 3, 4, 7, 12, 17, 20, 21, 24, 25, 28-31**

These claims would be patentable for the reasons given for their parent independent claims and for reasons given in prior amendments.

**Claims 6, 16, 27, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rankin et al. (2002/0135515) in view of McCarten et al. (5,959,596), in further view of Poch (5,152,003), in further view of Li et al. (6,205,418).** This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

With respect to claims 6, 16, and 27, the Examiner admits that Rankin, McCarten, and Poch do not specifically mention making said respective language choices accessible by an attendant so that said attendant can anticipate the language needs of a respective person. The Examiner looks to Li for a disclosure of “making said respective language choices accessible by an attendant so that said attendant can anticipate the language needs of a respective person.

Li is cited solely for the foregoing limited purpose and does not remedy the deficiencies of Rankin alone or in combination with McCarten and Poch. Thus, the claims would be patentable.

With respect to claim 32, the Examiner admits that Rankin, McCarten, and Poch do not specifically mention the system is operable to receive said language choices from an operator who has received the respective language choices from one or more of the passengers. The Examiner looks to Li for a disclosure of a system that “is operable to receive said language choices from an operator who has received the respective language choices **(Abstract).**”

Li is cited solely for the foregoing limited purpose and does not remedy the deficiencies of Rankin alone or in combination with McCarten and Poch. Thus, the claims would be patentable.

**Claims 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rankin et al. (2002/0135515) in view of McCarten et al. (5,959,596), in further view of Poch (5,152,003), in further view of Glenn (6,434,518).** This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

With respect to claims 8 and 10, the Examiner admits that Rankin and McCarten do not specifically mention a prerecorded audio translation in the language choice of a respective person, and look to Poch for a prerecorded audio translation in the language choice of a respective person **(Col 3 lines 65-66, Col 4 lines 31-37),** and to Glenn for “a message [that] is accessible by means of a headphone or ear-piece output allocated to a respective person, whereby a respective person can access said personal announcement by means of a headset connected to said output **(Col 3 lines 40-42),**” and a “message [that] comprises a prerecorded text translation of the message in the language choice of a respective person, accessible by means of a display allocated to said respective person, whereby said respective person can read said message on said display **(Fig. 2).**”

Glenn is cited solely for the foregoing limited purpose and does not remedy the deficiencies of Rankin alone or in combination with McCarten and Poch. Thus, the claims would be patentable.

**Claims 9, 11, 14, 15, 18, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rankin et al. (2002/0135515) in view of McCarten et al. (5,959,596), in further view of Poch (5,152,003), in further view of Kumano (5,978,754).** This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.



With respect to claims 11 and 19, the Examiner admits that “Rankin, McCarten, and Poch do not specifically mention real-time translation of a text announcement and making said personal announcement accessible by means of a display allocated to said respective person, whereby said respective person can read said personal announcement on said display.” The Examiner looks to Kumano for the disclosure of “textual real-time translation, **(Col 5 lines 25-30)**, and making the translation accessible by means of a display, whereby a person can read the translation on said display **(Fig 1, translated sentence display section 107)**.” Similar citations are given for claims 9, 14, 15 and 18.

Kumano is cited solely for the foregoing limited purpose and does not remedy the deficiencies of Rankin alone or in combination with McCarten and Poch. Thus, the claims would be patentable.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

*/Alan J. Kasper/*

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

---

Alan J. Kasper  
Registration No. 25,426

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: November 16, 2009